THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 April 1988

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of 17 March 1988 minutes.

B. Dates of next meetings:

19 May 1988
16 June 1988

C. H.J.Res.403, "To authorize the Raoul Wallenberg Committee to establish a monument to honor Raoul Wallenberg on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs." Report.

D. S.1776, "To modernize United States coin designs, of which one reverse will have a theme of the Bicentennial of the Constitution." Report.

E. Resolutions by State Legislatures of Connecticut and California on Vietnam's Women's Memorial. Report.

F. District of Columbia public hearing on third floor addition at 1215-30th Street, N. W., O.G. 87-202; 12 April 1988. Report.

G. D. C. Zoning Commission, case 87-4P, hearing on Capitol Point Development, PUD, 17 April 1988. Report.

H. Installation of Sculpture; Chaim Gross: Health and Human Services Building. Report.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. United States Holocaust Memorial Council

CFA 21/APR/88-1, Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, S. W., south of Auditors' Building. Further studies of design development. (Previously reviewed 22 May 1987, 19 June 1987, 18 February 1988, 17 March 1988.)

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 21/APR/88-2, International Cultural and Trade Center. Design guidelines for new complex within Federal Triangle on site of Great Plaza.

C. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

CFA 21/APR/88-3, Young Astronaut Program Medal, Public Law 99-295. Design of gold, silver, and bronze medals.

D. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce

a. S.L. 88-42, 7417 16th Street, N. W. Design for new two-story residence.

b. S.L. 88-60, 2328 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Design of rear addition to existing house.

c. S.L. 88-61,-62, 2202 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Design of two-story brick addition facing Cathedral Avenue, add a retaining wall and fence on periphery of front and side lot lines. Concept design.

d. S.L. 88-63, 2609 Klingle Road, N. W. Design of new single family residence.

e. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 88-119, 3610-12 P Street, N. W. Concept designs for two new townhouses. (Previously reviewed 19 November 1987, 17 December 1987, 21 January 1988.)

b. Appendix II.

E. House of Representatives Committee on Veterans Affairs; Subcommittee on Housing and Memorials

CFA 21/APR/88-4, Request for testimony on H.R.3742, "To authorize erection of a memorial and museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to Commemorate United States participation in that conflict."

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 88-59	19 2nd Street, N.E. Mr. & Mrs. G.B. Craighill, Jr. Residence	Replacement of front stoop - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of front stoop.

S.L. 88-55	210 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Capitol Hill EW Ltd. Part. Tortilla Coast Restaurant	Sign, fence paving, mechanical system - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed installation of sign, fence, paving and mechanical equipment.

S.L. 88-56	1 2nd Street, N.E. Florida House Washington, D.C. Inc. State Embassy	New steps and door - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for installation of proposed steps and door.

S.L. 88-58	209 1/2 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Bill Fenton Health's A-Poppin Restaurant	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awning.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 88-116	1069 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Wanchul Lee Office/Residence	Addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition shown on drawings received and dated 16 March 1988 which conform to previously approved concept submission. (See action O.G. 87-70)

O.G. 88-110	3335 Q Street, N.W. Grosvenor Chapman Residence	Addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition shown on drawings received and dated 2 March 1988 which conform to previously approved concept submission. (See action O.G. 87-194)

O.G. 88-115	1316 30th Street, N.W. Anne Witherspoon Residence	Roof alteration - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept for proposed raising of rear portion of existing roof to expand dormer area. Submit working drawings for permit review when ready.

O.G. 88-126	3225 Grace Street, N.W. Georgetown Park Condominium Association Residential	Enclose balconies - conceptual

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> concept as submitted. The proposal to infill the existing balconies with double-hung sheet glass is inappropriate. Recommend mesh screening with minimal support members behind railings.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 88-121	3128 M Street, N.W. Jean-Paul Amfellam Bistro-Francais Restaurant	First floor alterations - conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept as submitted. Character of proposed alteration is unsuitable to style and age of existing building.

O.G. 88-122	3126 M Street, N.W. Jean-Paul Amfellam Bistro-Francais Restaurant	First floor alterations - conceptual

ACTION: Recommend against concept as submitted. Character of proposed alteration is unsuitable to style and age of existing building.

O.G. 88-104	3203 Grace Street, N.W. New Moon Retail Store	Alterations, awnings,signs - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of marquee awnings suspended from tension rods at entrance and over show window on Grace Street. However, any signage and/or lighting to face over the historic C & O Canal must be coordinated with the National Park Service before further review by the Commission of Fine Arts.

O.G. 88-124	1512 30th Street, N.W. Nella S. Mehlman Residence	Guard rail - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed protective posts along alley wall as recommended by the D.C. Department of Transportation.

O.G. 88-111	3056 M Street, N.W. Christian Heurich III Dar Es Salam Restaurant	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed shed-type awning with lettering on the valance as shown on supplemental drawings received and dated 5 April 1988.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 88-109	2621 P Street, N.W. Robert and Beatrice Enzel P Street Pictures Store	Awning - permit

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. An awning at this corner location is not appropriate. Recommend study of a sign.

O.G. 88-117	3110 M Street, N.W. Canal Square Associates ACA JOE Clothing Store	Existing sign/ awning - permit

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit. The existing sign does not conform to the design previously approved for the same applicant or shown on drawings which indicate it behind the face of the building.

O.G. 88-106	3304 M Street, N.W. Roger and Paula Doyle The Great Kids Company	Existing sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing projecting sign.

O.G. 88-113	3223 M Street, N.W. 3223 Inc. Tom Taylor Clothing Store	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to design of sign provided letters are reduced to a maximum of 12 inches, provided that drawings confirming revised dimensions are submitted for CFA review prior to issuance of permit. Note: this approval excludes the proposed lighting which is disapproved as inappropriate.

O.G. 88-118	1057 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Rachid Benkerane Residence	Fence replacement - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood picket fence which is to be painted a neutral color.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 88-81	1057 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Benkerane Brothers Residence	Heat pump screen - permit

ACTION: No objection to screened roof-top heat pump provided that proposed wood screen is made of vertical boards with trim and horizontal cap at top and is painted the color of the house.

O.G. 88-31	1510 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Ziad Kabbani Moda Clothing Store	Awning - permit

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> issuance of permit for proposed awning as shown in drawings received and dated 9 November 1987. Recommend a shed-type awning with lettering confined to the valance. (This case was held at request of the applicant. Attempts to receive supplemental material from the applicant in the past months have been unsuccessful.)

O.G. 88-105	1071 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Mr. William Carey Copper Candle Store	Signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for installation of proposed signs as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 7 April 1988.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202–566–1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

21 April 1988

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W. Washington, D. C.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Neil H. Porterfield, Vice Chairman
Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver
Hon. Roy M. Goodman
Hon. Pascal Regan
Hon. Diane Wolf

STAFF PRESENT:
Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson
Mrs. Sue A. Kohler
Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. 17 March 1988 minutes were approved.

B. Dates of next meetings were approved as:

19 May 1988 (Thursday)
16 June 1988 (Thursday)
28 July 1988 (Thursday)

C. H.J.RES.403, "To authorize the Raoul Wallenberg Committee to establish a monument to honor Raoul Wallenberg on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs." The Secretary reported a letter had been sent to Ms. Oakar on behalf of the Commission after members had been polled by phone. He noted that Fifteenth Street had been renamed in Wallenberg's honor and that further commemoration and explanation would be appropriate within the adjacent Holocaust Memorial Museum itself. The Secretary had spoken to a member of the Holocaust Council who felt that this would be reasonable suggestion to consider further. The Memorial Advisory Committee had taken a similar position. No further action was required.

EXHIBIT A

D. S.1776, "To modernize United States coin designs, of which one reverse will have a theme of the Bicentennial of the Constitution." The Secretary mentioned that there would be a hearing on the following day and that the Commission would be represented by Miss Wolf. A copy of the testimony would be inserted in the minutes for the record. EXHIBIT B

E. Resolution by State Legislatures of Connecticut and California on Vietnam Women's Memorial. The Secretary reported that the assemblies of both states had sent resolutions opposing the Commission's disapproval of adding a statue of an army nurse to the Vietnam memorial. EXHIBIT C, C-1

F. District of Columbia public hearing on third-floor addition at 1215-30th Street, N. W., O.G. 87-202; 12 April 1988. The Assistant Secretary reported that he had represented the Commission in opposition to the project, in accord with the Commission's action. He indicated that Georgetown ANC Commissioner Shannon was also there as were some of the neighbors. Commission members asked to have a report on the hearing officer's findings when available. EXHIBIT D

G. District of Columbia Zoning Commission, case 87-4P, hearing on Capitol Point Development, PUD, 17 April 1988. The Secretary reported that he had represented the Commission which had toured the site 18 February 1988 and had been concerned about possible excessive height adjacent to historic Ft. McNair. He also pointed out that the Commission would review any designs for this project under a little known act of Congress which gave the Commission approval authority under the Shipstead-Luce Act. He reported that the Zoning Commission would refer the matter to the Commission for comment.

H. Installation of Sculpture: Chaim Gross: Health and Human Services Building. The Secretary said that a mock-up of the sculpture had been viewed on 15 April 1988 and found to be inappropriate. A recommendation was made that the proposed siting be disapproved with an offer to look at an alternate proposal in the future if the department choses to go ahead with the project. EXHIBIT E

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. United States Holocaust Memorial Council

1. CFA 21/APR/88-1, Holocaust Memorial Museum between 14th and 15th Streets, S. W., south of Auditors' Building. Further studies of design development. (Previously reviewed 22 May 1987, 19 June 1987, 18 February 1988, 17 March 1988.)

The Assistant Secretary referred to the Commission's March request for further study and refinement of the concept design of the western elevations including the treatment of some architectural elements on the Hall of Remembrance. New designs had been prepared for the Commission's consideration. He introduced the Director of the Holocaust Museum, Mr. Arthur Rosenblatt.

Mr. Rosenblatt said that he was happy to have the opportunity to respond to the Commission's March recommendations and to introduce Mr. Albert Abramson, Chairman, and Mr. Robert Mendelsohn, Vice President of the Museum Development Committee. He then introduced Mr. James Freed, of I.M. Pei and Partners, to make the presentation.

Mr. Freed presented a new model showing revised treatment of the Hall of Remembrance in a cut-away fashion. He indicated that substantial study had taken place and showed slides of how blind windows were treated on other Washington monumental buildings. A revised proposal showed them in stone, instead of brick, as had been objected to in March. He went on to make a point that the Hall of Remembrance was an internal space with very limited and controlled natural lighting. He showed a proposal to have blind panels with inscriptions on the ground floor rather than an open arcade as originally proposed. The Commission had reservations about the introduction of quotations, but suggested that this could be discussed as a refinement at a later stage.

There was some general discussion, with Mrs. Regan complimenting the architects. Mrs. Deaver thanked them for going the extra step for a very fine solution. Mr. Porterfield seconded Mrs. Deaver's comments. Senator Goodman said that the time had come for a resolution approving the designs submitted by the architect on behalf of the Holocaust Council. Mrs. Regan seconded the motion. With the motion on the floor, Mr. Porterfield and Miss Wolf asked for and were given reassurances that the Holocaust Council did not intend to reopen the issue of razing Annex 3. Messrs. Abramson and Mendelsohn indicated that they were presidential appointees and were limited in their ability to speak indefinitely into the future for their successors but the present position supported retention. It was also pointed out that the building is a registered landmark and a full inquiry under the Advisory Council would be required if the issue were reopened. With that understanding the vote to approve the design was unanimous. EXHIBIT F

CFA 21 April 88 - 1
Holocaust Memorial
Approved design

B. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

2. CFA 21/APR/88-2, International Cultural and Trade Center. Design guidelines for new complex within the Federal Triangle on site of Great Plaza.

Mr. Myer introduced this discussion by reviewing the Commission's 1987 opinion that new construction in the Great Plaza and infilling the gap between the District Building and the Ariel Rios Building on Pennsylvania Avenue should be in architectural harmony with adjacent structures, should have a percentage of the overall budget dedicated to integration of public artwork in the initial design, and should not be too massive. Advance copies of the design guidelines had been sent to the members and a full presentation would be made with drawings and models. Though architectural harmony and public artwork provisions were included in the present document, size remained a question. Both the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Review Board had added their voices to concern about over programming the site and a proposed maximum height of 137 feet to match the central 15th Street portico of the Commerce Building to the West. A maximum height closer to the rest of the Federal Triangle had been suggested along with a substantial reduction in mass.

Mr. Jay Brodie, Executive Director of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, then made a formal presentation showing general envelope, or mass studies, indicating that specific designs would be sought from a public/private partnership open competition system which would be subject to Commission review at a later time. The guidelines were for purposes of suggesting parameters to the future designers. He added that legislation had authorized the PADC to manage the project which had been launched by the Federal City Council, the General Services Administration and the Department of State. The Chairman interjected that former Senator Charles Percy and Mr. Harry McPherson had been appointed Chairman and Vice Chairman of the International Cultural and Trade Center Board. Mr. Brodie then went on to discuss specific design aspects of the guidelines.

There was some general discussion about the presentation materials, with Mrs. Regan getting reassurance that there would be no on-grade parking allowed. Mr. Porterfield and the Chairman established that the 3.1 million square feet shown on the model and given in the legislation were an outer limit, or maximum, not a requirement. Mr. Brodie pointed out that a critical mass would be required to make the project economically viable to developers and to provide the lively mix of retail, office and public service uses anticipated. Mrs. Deaver suggested that the

portals flanking the Departmental Auditorium should be responded to in the design of any new scheme. This was echoed by Mr. Porterfield and agreed to by Mr. Brodie. Miss Wolf added that she found the hemicycles of the Federal Triangle unique and successful design elements and hoped that the new structures could incorporate a feature responsive to them. Mr. Porterfield asked if the amount of the parking was fixed, and if not, whether reductions could allow more below-grade uses as a way of achieving above-grade mass reduction. Mr. Brodie indicated that there were limits because of underground water on how far down the project could go and that market conditions and obligations for parking were not all that flexible. Though 1900 cars were presently parked on the site, the project anticipated only 1300 cars in below grade garages.

The Commission concluded its discussion by emphasizing its concern for a reduction in overall mass. There was a consensus that the top layer of the model, which was removable and took the height down from that of the Commerce attic story to the rest of the Triangle, should be left off for a start; an exception to this would be that section of the new development directly across from Commerce on 14th Street, which could match that building's attic in height. After further general discussion the members agreed that an overall above-grade reduction of 20-25% percent would be close to what would allow maximum flexibility for a good design solution without overwhelming the space. Mr. Brodie indicated that he would get together with GSA and review the economic implications of a smaller building. The members of the Commission were in agreement on these points. EXHIBIT G

C. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

3. CFA 21/APR/88-3, Young Astronaut Program Medal, Public Law 99-295. Design of gold, silver, and bronze medals.

Mrs. Kohler showed drawings depicting three medals designed by school children who participated in the Young Astronaut Program to encourage study and improvement in math and science skills. Sale of the medals would raise money for the program.

The members examined the designs noting that there was a common reverse. Miss Wolf was concerned that some of the vitality of children's work could be impaired by outside artistic interpretation. The members felt that there were too many elements in the designs. The Chairman suggested asking the Mint to return with the three-dimensional plaster models as part of the exploration of eliminating some of the design elements. Miss Wolf pointed out that coins are a reflection of civilization and self-perception. She added that children learn to appreciate

coins early and that appreciation can continue and that the artist should consider the following in coin design: simplicity, elegance, and "less is more." Additional study was the unanimous recommendation of the Commission. EXHIBIT H

D. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 88-42, 7417 16th Street, N. W. Design for a new two-story residence.

Mr. Carson introduced the second discussion of this new house design by saying that several alternatives had been explored by the staff and the owners, Mr. & Mrs. Bookholtz, and that the design had also been shown to the Advisory Neighborhood Commission. The Chairman noted that there remained some differences, but that from the Commission's jurisdictional point of view these details would not have an effect from Rock Creek Park across 16th Street. The Commission members felt that the design was acceptable and it was passed without objection. EXHIBIT I

b. S.L. 88-60, 2328 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Design for a rear addition to an existing house.

Mr. Martinez described that project for a breakfast room addition to the rear of a townhouse west of Sheridan Circle and backing up to Rock Creek Park. Though the addition was quite small it projected to the rear of a row of houses more than those to the west, and somewhat above the garden to the east. The architect, Mr. Dudley Canada, was present and showed the members his design. The breakfast room was on the second level of the house and was designed to be reminiscent of a gazebo. Below it a screen porch area was proposed. The adjacent neighbors to the east, Mr. and Mrs. S. Dillon Ripley, were present and objected to the addition because of its rearward projection. There was some general discussion about just how high and far back the addition would go.

The Chairman pointed out that there was very limited impact to Rock Creek Park posed by the addition, which was quite small. He suggested, however, that the Commission not act until the neighbors and the ANC had a chance for further discussion. The matter was deferred without objection. EXHIBIT I

c. S.L. 88-61,-62, 2202 Cathedral Avenue, N. W. Design for a two-story brick addition facing Cathedral Avenue, N. W., add a retaining wall and fence on periphery of front and side of lot lines. Concept design.

Mr. Myer indicated that there were two separate issues - the addition and the fence. The addition had been proposed for this corner house to project into the front yard line of the block of houses facing Rock Creek Park and the Zoo. This would be the only such protrusion beyond the facade line. The owner, Mrs. Lisa O'Brien, was present and indicated that she would be happy to withdraw discussion of the addition because it seemed to pose problems and she was eager to get the fence and retaining wall resolved. The ANC would meet the following week and there were some changes proposed as a result of neighborhood discussions. Originally the fence would be lattice on a timber retaining wall. The modified plan was for an iron fence on a stucco-finish masonry block wall.

The Chairman suggested further discussion within the community and additional information, pinning down the exact proposal for the fence and retaining wall. The Commission had no objection to the installation per se provided that exact information and coordination with community concerns could be met. Discussion of the addition could take place at another time. The Chairman also indicated that a complete submission for the porch addition should include a composite photograph of the block showing the context of the proposal and be coordinated with the community in advance. EXHIBIT I

d. S.L. 88-63, 2609 Klingle Road, N. W. Design for new single family residence.

Mr. Martinez presented photographs, drawings and a model of the proposed new single family residence. A large free-standing structure with numerous roof levels and wings had been coordinated by the staff with the ANC and by the owner with adjacent neighbors. The only comment had been a suggestion that the exterior wall finish be shingle rather than stucco, which would enhance the building's contextual compatibility with the neighborhood. The members agreed that the shingle appearance would be best, citing historical precedents, and suggested that to the applicants, who were present. The concept design was approved with that recommendation. EXHIBIT I

e. Appendix I, relating to several Shipstead-Luce Act cases, was approved unanimously.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 88-119, 3610 P Street, N. W. Concept designs for two new townhouses. (Previously reviewed 19 November 1987, 17 December 1987.)

Mr. Carson presented revised designs for a pair of two-story, English-basement townhouses on a site where four

smaller houses had been damaged by fire, and then condemned and razed. The Georgetown Board had reviewed the designs on April 5 and asked for additional study of the proportions, particularly of the principal floor windows. One of the members had additionally asked for another study comparing a stepped roof line to a single roof line. With these things done the Board's consensus was that the Commission should view the plans and consider approval for final development. Mr. Carson presented the drawings viewed at the Board's meeting and the two variations sent to the Board prior to the Commission's meeting to confirm that their directives had been taken. Mr. William Cochran, the architect, was introduced.

Miss Wolf asked Mr. Cochran about the height of the houses. He indicated that because they were to be on a slope, the height was not consistent, but the average was very close to the 23 feet (measured from the sidewalk) suggested by the Commission in its previous action. Mrs. McDermid, representing the ANC, claimed that the measuring point should be the bottom of the front areaway, not the walk, and, therefore, the designs did not comply with previous Commission action. Mr. Carson mentioned that height as measured in accord with the BOCA code related to this matter. (The code measures from grade, not areaways, as may be the case for zoning matters when more than half of the entire perimeter of the building has an areaway.) The Chairman failed to find any relevance to this discussion saying that it was the silhouette in the streetscape that mattered.

Mr. Guy Goodwin, a neighbor, appeared and objected to the design on the basis of mass, saying that the English basement added massiveness beyond what was typical of the neighborhood. Mrs. Boyd made a statement asking that the Commission reaffirm its language in the previous transmittal letter. The Chairman stated that the relevant matter was the streetscape, and the compatibility of the roofline in the neighborhood, and not interpretations of height measurement or number of storeys inside the building envelope, and that the Commission had held the applications up sufficiently and asked if a member wished to make a motion. Mrs. Regan moved approval, and Mrs. Deaver seconded it. Without objection, approval was passed. EXHIBIT I

b. Appendix II on Georgetown was approved.

E. House of Representatives Committee on Veterans Affairs; Subcommittee on Housing and Memorials

4. CFA 21/APR/88-4, Request for testimony on H.R.3742, "To authorize erection of a memorial and museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict."

The Secretary said that the Commission had been invited to testify at a hearing that very morning, which was not possible, but would like to submit comments for the record. He indicated that the proposal had been discussed by the Memorial Advisory Committee, who were in favor of the legislation. He indicated that the proposal includes a provision for a museum in the memorial; and it was thought that such a museum would be better if it were not actually a part of the memorial.

The Secretary also said the Advisory Committee also strongly recommended that the memorial be financed largely through public funds, as an appropriate expression of the gratitude of all Americans, and not privately funded.

The Chairman and Mrs. Deaver pointed out that the legislation did in fact provide for a mix of both private and public funds. The Secretary was asked if the memorial would require Commission of Fine Arts advice or approval. He indicated that the memorial would be covered by the Commemorative Works Act of 1986 which requires approval by the Commission of Fine Arts. There was no objection to making these points in a letter to the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorials. EXHIBIT J

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

21 March 1988

Dear Mrs. Oakar:

The Commission recently learned that hearings are scheduled for 23 March 1988 on a bill to authorize the erection of a memorial to Raoul Wallenberg (H.J.Res.403).

Unfortunately news of this bill arrived the day after our regular monthly meeting on 17 March, so it was not on our formal order of business for action. However, I have polled the members since then, and it is the consensus that I should express the Commission's opposition to this bill at your hearing.

As you know, a portion of Fifteenth Street, N.W. south of Independence Avenue in front of the planned Holocaust Memorial and Museum was recently renamed in Mr. Wallenberg's honor, and a suitable plaque was installed just down the street from the memorial site. Since this is an accomplished fact, the Commission believes that any additional commemoration should be included within the Holocaust Memorial and Museum itself rather than in the form of another outdoor monument. The Museum's capacity for displays relating to the Holocaust are considerable, and given the context of the material to be displayed, the educational and emotional impact of such a commemorative element would be far greater here than on a site removed from the memorial itself. The Commission would hope that this solution would be acceptable to the Holocaust Memorial Council.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

The Honorable
Mary Rose Oakar
Chairperson House Subcommittee
on Libraries and Memorials
U. S. House of Representatives
720 H.O.B. Annex 1
Washington, D.C. 20515

EXHIBIT B

S1776-Congressional Testimony

OF

Diane Wolf

MEMBER,

Commission of Fine Arts

APRIL 22, 1988

UNITED STATES SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE

Testimony

Mr. Chairman, distinguished committee members, guests.
My name is Diane Wolf. I am a member of the United States Commission of Fine Arts.

It is my distinct pleasure and honor to address you today on a matter which I feel can be of great benefit to the United States, both aesthetically and financially.

On April 16, 1987, the Commission of Fine Arts passed my following resolution unanimously: "In view of the historic frequency with which United States coins have been changed, the Commission of Fine Arts recommends to the United States Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury that they consider in a timely way changing the obverse and reverse designs of the cent, nickel, dime, quarter and half dollar by invited compensated competition."

The Commission's involvement in such competitions stretches back to 1916 when the Mercury dime, Liberty Standing quarter and the Walking Liberty half-dollar were selected as the nation's new coin designs. Since that time, the Commission has played an important role in new coin designs.

It might interest you to know that two of the nation's most distinguished coin designs, the Walking Liberty half-dollar and the Buffalo nickel were created by one-time Commission members, Adolf Weinman and James E. Fraser. Augustus St. Gaudens, the designer of the St. Gaudens double-eagle and eagle gold coin, was a member of the McMillan Commission, which evolved into the Commission of Fine Arts.

I introduced my resolution not because I had any hope for personal monetary gain, for I do not collect coins, nor do I make any portion of my living from the buying and selling of coins.

Any expenses I have incurred on behalf of this project have been paid out of my own pocket. I have no intention of any monetary gain in the past, present, or future from this endeavor.

As I have come to learn, the coins which we carry in our pockets, and the designs on them represent many things to many different people. To most Americans they are a vital part of their financial activity every day.

To the Mint, they are a source of great revenue due to seigniorage, which is the difference between the face value of a coin and its cost of production. U.S. circulating coin production results in a profit each year in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, the Mint's single largest source of revenue is from seigniorage.

To the rest of the world, our coins and their designs are quite literally our nation's calling cards. They travel the globe. Countless millions who have no contact whatsoever with the United States and our people know our coins. Not only do our coins tell people in faraway lands something

about us and our heroes, ideals, dreams, and celebrations, they also speak to the ages.

We can hold in our hands a coin struck thousands of years ago. Long after the person who created the coin and the ones who used it are gone, the coin remains. Long after these past civilization's writings, buildings and virtually every other evidence of their world has vanished, the coins of ancient Greece, Rome, Egypt and other lands remain to educate and remind future generations about their existence. Coins exist in enormous quantities. People in the year 2988, 3988, or 4988 well may not remember all we do or say here today, but chances are excellent that they will know the coins we carried in our pockets and learn from them what was of greatest importance to us as a civilization- what we admired most and held in greatest esteem.

Those are some of the reasons I have become concerned about coins. Our coins need to represent the best in America. They should represent our best technology, our best ideas. Our coins should celebrate the reason our country is so special: liberty, justice, freedom and democracy. These ideals should be depicted through renderings by our best artists.

As the Commission thought about the importance of our coins both in terms of our history and in what they say about us today, it became aware that the stagnation which has plagued American coin design in recent times has made little sense and is a poor reflection of our great land and wonderful people of today.

I come to speak on behalf of Senate Bill 1776, for it seeks the changes the Commission feels are so badly needed in our circulating coin designs.

The United States has seen major coin changes 33 times in the past. As recently as 1975-6 the reverses of the quarter, half dollar and dollar coins were changed to celebrate the Bicentennial of American Revolution. In 1964 we had a complete change in the half dollar coin. In 1959, the reverse of the one cent coin was changed. Prior to that, change in our coin designs were closer to the rule than the exception. (See Table A for dates of major coin design changes.)

Today the Commission would like to pay tribute to Senator Armstrong and the other 60 plus Senators who have joined in sponsoring this measure in the Senate. The Commission would also like to pay tribute to Representative Rangel and the other 90 plus members of Congress who have taken similar action in the House of Representatives.

As you deliberate this issue today, you will hear from other witnesses who can better address in some detail some of the specific considerations and concerns about this Bill. I would, however, like to briefly address both the potential concerns and the positive contributions of this legislation.

Under law, the Secretary of Treasury may change circulating coin designs every 25 years. Congress may do so whenever it wishes. However, the portrait of Abraham Lincoln currently found on the obverse one cent coin is 79 years old. The quarter design is 56 years old. The Buffalo nickel was changed fifty years ago. The Mercury dime was last minted 42 years ago. This is the 25th year President Kennedy has appeared on the half dollar.

The question the Commission asked itself was if there was any particular advantage in keeping the current designs. We think not. Great Britain changes its obverse designs with the passing of each monarch. If the monarchs enjoy a long life, as they have done in recent years and as did Queen Victoria, the British Empire changes the portrait to reflect the natural aging process. Such regular changes seem to have had no adverse impact on that great nation or on others such as Canada and Australia, who follow Great Britain's lead.

One factor which has been raised in support of not changing designs is that it prevents confusion. Such concerns seem to me to be without foundation, if not downright laughable. There was no confusion in 1976 when the reverses of three coins were changed to celebrate the Bicentennial of the American Revolution or in 1964 when the Kennedy half dollar coin was introduced. In fact, in 1964 we had three different half dollars circulating at the same time. They were the Kennedy, Franklin and Walking Liberty half dollars.
In 1959, when the cent reverse was changed to reflect the Lincoln Memorial, there was no confusion. Historically, there has been virtually no evidence of confusion when a coin design has been changed.

This bill calls only for design changes. It does <u>not</u> call for changing size, shape, color, or denomination of the coins. Surely, if every generation from our founding fathers to those who mourned the loss of John F. Kennedy to those who celebrated the Bicentennial of the American Revolution in 1975-6 can experience a coin design change without confusion, then we can also manage such a change in 1989.

Coin shortages are not a problem when changing coin designs. Surplus is in the billions. On July 15, 1987, in response to questions posed by the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, Mint Director Donna Pope announced that Denver Mint coin production was at the rate of 6.3 billion coins per year. The reason for this production of 1.3 billion coins per year less than capacity was, "Because we are intentionally drawing down inventories." At the same time, according to the Director's responses, the ongoing installation of the new Schuler coin presses at Denver will increase production capacity to approximately 9 billion coins per year.

Under the circumstances, I would have to observe that if the United States was ever in a position to meet a greater than usual coin demand, that time is now.

Potential revenue derived from new coin designs must be considered one of the most compelling reasons for circulating design changes. The potential revenue will be raised through seigniorage and numismatic sales.

David C. Harper, editor of Numismatic News, who is a panelist today, can best answer the question of how much can be raised. I feel confident in stating that design changes will result in increased revenue. We can be certain that changing designs will create revenue both from people wanting to save the new coins and from collectors wanting to buy special Proof and Mint sets of the new designs.

If we are to fully and honestly examine the matter of the economic advantages to be realized because of a coin design changes, there are some additional considerations which were not included in the Numismatic News figure or to the best of my knowledge in the considerations of anyone else.
While we base all of our potential income on increased demand for new coins, there is a consideration which is probably even more of a historical certainty. For the first few years after design changes, the public will tend to save the new designs. With time, however, they will begin to save the old coins. Ultimately, millions of the old coins will find their way not back to the Federal Reserve System, but rather to jars, drawers and small accumulations all over this land.

Another of what I would call the "hidden economic benefits" from coin design changes has to do with the potential impact in terms of encouraging the collecting of coins. While neither anyone else nor I would suggest to you that the government of the United States should be in the business of worrying about, or helping to promote a hobby; like stamp collecting, the collecting of coins is in the national interest. This is for the very simple reason that the government of the United States is the nation's largest stamp dealer and yes, it is also the nation's largest coin dealer.

Lest anyone doubt my contention, I submit to you some numbers contained in Mint Director Donna Pope's same introductory statement before the House Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage. In the very first paragraph of Mrs. Pope's remarks she stated, "Revenues from coin programs exceeded $1.5 billion, prompting some industry commentators to claim the Mint was part of the Fortune 500."

Contained elsewhere in her comments, Mrs. Pope pointed to the Statue of Liberty Coin Program, a commemorative one-year program, which saw collectors purchase the entire allocation of $5 gold coins in less than two months. The bottom line for the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation was $83 million while our "Fortune 500" Mint realized "an operating profit of approximately $30 million."

Mrs. Pope went on to report the issuance of a 1986 catalog of Mint products and estimated the profit from that mailing at $4.1 million. At roughly the same time the Mint offered people on its mailing list the opportunity to purchase proof one ounce gold and silver American Eagle bullion coins. Given approximately one month to place their orders, the nation's collectors responded. Mrs. Pope put it simply, "Coin collectors purchased over 446,000 proof gold and 1.4 million proof silver coins." The total dollars in purchases by collectors in that instance alone was roughly one-quarter billion dollars. The United States government is the nation's leading coin dealer and as such, it had better be concerned about its customers.

Already we see signs of trouble in paradise. Orders for 1988 proof bullion coins were down. Authorizations for Congressional commemoratives were reviewed by this committee and serious thought was given to the idea of cutting those authorizations because the nation's collectors would not buy that many coins.

My observation to you, is that we are just starting to see the problem. In the past year, I have visited many of the nation's top coin shows. There I have talked with hobby leaders, dealers and collectors. I must report to you today that they are concerned, very concerned. Just as our coin designs are stagnant, so too apparently are the numbers of coin collectors. Virtually every leading figure in coin collecting in this country has told me we need new designs to attract the interest of new collectors and especially the young. Without such action, the number of coin collectors in this country might very well shrink. If the number of young collectors I've seen at coin shows is any indication, we won't have to bother with new commemoratives and proof bullion coins at all in a few years, because there won't be enough

collectors of such items around to make it worth our while. Habits learned young are habits one has for a lifetime.

If, however, the circulating designs are changed, virtually every hobby leader, rare coin dealer and collector has told me that the result would be increased numbers of collectors for everything from old rare coins to our proof sets, bullion coins and commemoratives.

If any other company in the Fortune 500 was offered the opportunity to make money simply by changing the design of a product, while also improving potential sales of other products, it would do so in a minute! Almost anyone can see why it is in the government's best interest to do what it can do to encourage coin collecting and especially the collecting of new U.S. coins. Simply put, the government stands to profit the most if such collecting expands.

A final observation on the matter of the financial rewards of changing coin designs is something which will bring the economic impact right into the backyards of some members of the committee.

The government, as the nation's largest coin dealer, stands to benefit the most from a strong base of coin collectors. Of that there can be no doubt. There are, however, others who would benefit. As I have travelled around the country to coin shows, I have been struck by the fact that this hobby and the businesses which serve it including the U.S. Mint, have a very real economic impact on widely scattered areas.

Looking in the coin publications, you might be surprised at the literally hundreds of coin shows across the land each week. In many areas of the country, coin collectors, dealers and others in numismatics have a very real economic impact. There is no doubt, a healthy rare coin industry means jobs and dollars for other businesses.

The distinguished Chairman of this Committee is from Wisconsin. There are probably few states which benefit more from the business of coin collecting. In Iola, Wisconsin there are few, if any, larger employers than Krause Publications, which produces a wide variety of coin publications. Other publishers can be found in Ventura, California and Sidney, Ohio.

Coins need plastic holders and coin collectors need catalogs. The most successful producer of both can be found in Racine, Wisconsin. Other firms in other states have supplied the boxes and holders for American Eagle and commemorative coins.

There are thousands of coin conventions all over the country each year. For example, in Long Beach, California, there are three per year, filling the Hyatt Regency Hotel there while providing the local convention center, security forces, restaurants, shops and an assortment of others with plenty of financial gain. During the past year, major conventions have taken place in such locations as New York City, Atlanta, Georgia, St. Louis, Missouri, and Chicago, Illinois.

Lest anyone think that encouraging the collecting of a government produced product is new and revolutionary, think again. The Post Office has been doing it for years, constantly changing stamps designs. They advertise, thus encouraging stamp collecting and enlarging the potential market for their products. Last year alone, the Post Office realized profits of $173 million from the sale of commemorative stamps. Until recently, no such efforts had been made by the Mint. Thus it is no surprise that the nation's largest hobby is generally regarded to be stamps.

Summarized briefly, on the financial end, changing circulating coin designs is destined to make money for the United States. There is no better time to do it. In the process, we will help to expand the potential sales of additional Mint products ranging from proof sets to bullion coins to commemoratives, all of which will result in additional revenue. In the process, the public will retire the coins circulating today. I can hardly imagine a better outcome for everyone, and one achieved without raising taxes.

When I consider the worthwhile things we could be doing with the revenue generated, be it applied to the national debt or used to save programs threatened by budgetary constraints, I doubt seriously that there are many who would want to stand in the way of such an idea. This is one reason why S1776 arrives before you today with 60 co-sponsors.

Today, that numismatic community speaks to us in a virtually unanimous voice. The congressionally chartered American Numismatic Association will testify today. The major numismatic publications have endorsed the concept of changing the designs on our circulating coins. If there were time, we could have had one noted numismatist after another here today. I can assure you that they would support this legislation. If anything, many would tell us to go further than simple modernization of the obverses.

This time, however, support for circulating coin design changes has gone beyond the boundaries of numismatics. I am here today because the United States Commission of Fine Arts has been on record for over a year. We too want change, and we are unanimous. The Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States has been on record for months. They too are unanimous, supporting the idea of the Bicentennial of the Constitution theme on a circulating coin.

As for the public, consider the reception accorded the American Eagle bullion coins. Consider the popularity of our commemoratives. When exposed to new coins, the public seems to respond very favorably. The more the public understands the finances involved, the more it finds new coin designs an awfully good idea, especially if the alternative is raising taxes.

During the past 16 months as I've traveled the country talking to people about coins, I've had many memorable experiences. What I most enjoyed is hearing from the people. I've had teachers tell me that coins were an excellent educational tool and new designs would be a wonderful new teaching tool. Being a former elementary school teacher myself, I agree. I've had parents say they hope this idea succeeds because it might get their children collecting coins, which would teach them about savings, and about history. Most of all, it might give them a constructive way to spend their time, away from the streets and the potential problems found there.

After explaining the matter, I've had reporters tell me they had never thought about coins and their designs before and then ask why this hadn't been done sooner. I've had taxicab drivers tell me to keep up the good work. Artists have thanked me for taking an interest in giving the artists of today a chance, something which is being denied by our current design stagnation. More touching to me, however, have been the <u>thousands</u> of letters to me from the public. Put in their own words, the public would like coins in which

they can take pride. Many times, when meeting people, they will pull out an old Buffalo nickel or Indian head cent, and tell me that they are coins which made them proud to be Americans, while the current designs are ordinary or boring.

When you think about it, our coins are one of the few things all Americans have in common. We have much to be proud of in the United States. In virtually every American, pride burns. We want the words "United States of America" to be synonymous with the best; be it art, technology, ideas or anything else. The coins we use today are not the best we can do.

We cannot con the American people. They know we can do better. After 200 years as a nation, they know what we've done in the past. They want us to continue to strive to be the best in the world, whether it's in music, the arts, medicine, or maintaining peace. We can do better with our coins. They know it. The Commission of Fine Arts knows it and I'm sure you know it.

We Americans have always been a restless people. Always there has always been one more river to cross, one more mountain to climb and one more idea to explore. We honor our leaders and take pride in our past. Stagnation and complacency are an anathema to us. Today we stand on the brink of our third century as a nation. We need to embrace that new century with the enthusiasm with which those who have come before embraced their new challenges and opportunities.

Our coins have often reflected our spirit as a nation and as a people. Our coins have shown Liberty offering an olive branch while prepared for self-defense. Such images were an accurate reflection of the spirit of the time before World War I. We need to reflect our spirit as a nation today as well. The images and symbols from the Great Depression will no longer suffice. We need images and symbols created by our best artists for this generation and for our time if we are to convince not only the world, but even our own people that America has not grown complacent.

We cannot put a price tag on pride; pride in ourselves and pride in our country. Our new coins should reflect our spirit not only in our lifetime, but for eternity. As is, I can say to you that the Commission supports coin design changes, both for what they can do for us today, and what they will say about us tomorrow. The Commission hopes you agree and will support S.1776. Thank you.

TABLE A

Major Coin Design Changes

$.01	$.05	$.10	$.25	$.50
1857	1886	1796	1796	1794
1859	1883	1798 rev.	1804 rev.	1796 obv.
1909	1913	1809	1815	1801 rev.
1959 rev.	1938	1837	1838	1807 total
		1892	1892	1839
		1916	1916	1892
		1946	1932	1916
			1975-6 rev.	1948
				1964
				1975-6 rev.

State Capitol
P.O. Box 942849
ramento, CA 94249-0001

Telephone: 445-3614

Assembly
California Legislature

EXHIBIT C

R. BRIAN KIDNEY
Chief Clerk

APR

April 6, 1988

J. Carter Brown
Chairman
Fine Arts Commission
708 Jackson Place NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Brown:

I have been directed to invite your attention to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 58, relative to a memorial to women Vietnam veterans.

Accordingly, a copy of this resolution is enclosed for your information.

Very truly yours,

R. BRIAN KIDNEY
Chief Clerk

RBK:mjc
Enclosure

State of Connecticut

EXHIBIT C-1

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 20

Introduced by

Sen. Matthews of the 9th Dist., Sen. Larson of the 3rd Dist., Sen. O'Leary of the 7th Dist., Sen. Smith of the 8th Dist., Sen. Mustone of the 13th Dist., Sen. Barrows of the 2nd Dist., Sen. Eads of the 30th Dist., Sen. Freedman of the 26th Dist., Sen. Herbst of the 35th Dist., and Sen. Morton of the 23rd Dist.

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE EFFORTS OF THE VIETNAM WOMEN'S MEMORIAL PROJECT

Resolved by the Senate:

WHEREAS, The Congress of the United States authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to honor the men and women who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Vietnam War; and

WHEREAS, the present Memorial includes a statue depicting "Three Fighting Men" to honor the service of military personnel during that war; and

WHEREAS, over two hundred sixty three thousand women, many of them citizens of Connecticut, volunteered for military duty during Vietnam, and more than ten thousand of these women, most of them military nurses and hundreds of women who worked for civilian support organizations, actually served under combat conditions in Vietnam; and

WHEREAS, The Vietnam Women's Memorial Project has worked since 1984 to honor the service of all women who served in and with the Armed Forces during Vietnam by placing a statue of an Army Nurse at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.; and

WHEREAS, the Secretary of the Interior has approved this statue but the Fine Arts Commission of Washington, D.C. has rejected the proposal.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we the members of this Senate express our support for the very appropriate efforts of The Vietnam Women's Memorial Project to honor the women who served our nation during the Vietnam War; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we the members of this Senate urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Fine Arts Commission and the Capitol Planning Commission of Washington, D.C. to expedite the process for placing the statue proposed by the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the clerk of the Senate cause a copy of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Fine Arts Commission and the Capitol Planning Commission of Washington, D.C.

Thomas P. Sheridan
Clerk of the Senate

Julia H. Tashjian
Secretary of the State

Adopted March 23, 1988

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT E

9 May 1988

Dear Mr. Chertoff:

At our meeting on 21 April, the secretary reported on his inspection of the mock-up of the Chaim Gross sculpture Family at Play that had been temporarily installed on the north terrace of your headquarters building. We appreciate the efforts to provide the mock-up which apparently was well worth the effort because it so clearly demonstrated the problems of size and scale in relation to the building and its foreground space; the existing statue is too small for the site.

Since this inspection, however, the Commission received material from the sculptor that indicated he was aware of the size problem all along, and had intended the statue to be mounted on a base at least 8 or 9 feet above grade. I am enclosing a copy of his sketch for your information.

If you wish to pursue the installation further, I again would ask that a modified mock-up be provided so we can see how the sculpture looks on site, which, incidentally, the artist sees as a location on the northwest steps toward Independence Avenue, and not on top of the "pyramid". That site, no matter what the height of the base, would probably be the wrong spot, at least in the opinion of our staff.

Let us know if you plan on any additional mock-up, and we will be happy to come over and inspect it.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Stephen E. Chertoff
Executive Assistant to
the Secretary
U.S. Department of Health
and Human Services
330 Independence Ave.,S.W., Room 4300
Washington, D.C. 20201

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT F

9 May 1988

Dear Arthur:

I am happy to confirm the Commission's approval on 21 April 1988 of final conceptual designs for the Holocaust Memorial. The changes made to the design were very responsive to our concerns, and we appreciate the efforts made by all concerned, and especially the architect, James Freed.

As you know, the Commission conditoned its approval on the retention of Annex 3, and your withdrawal of the application to raze this structure was a welcome reassurance of your intentions. While we both agreed that neither Commission can irrevocably commit our successors to this action, I think it would be useful to state clearly at this time that the Commission of Fine Arts believes the removal of this structure would be a mistake. Not only does the building have merit of its own, it contributes to the urban design of the entire ensemble of Auditors complex and the Holocaust Museum in such a way that its removal would be a real loss. For this reason, I hope that this structure can continue to serve as a good if humble neighbor of your museum.

The Commission would like to follow the progress of the design as it develops, and to review some of the unfinished business such as exterior sculpture, if any, landscaping, and of course the inspection of a final material mock-up on the site.

Sincerely ,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Arthur Rosenblatt
U.S. Holocaust Memorial
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1150
Washington, D.C. 20036

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT G

9 May 1988

Dear Hank:

The Commission of Fine Arts is happy to report on its review of the design guidelines for the International Cultural and Trade Center which it discussed at its meeting on 21 April 1988. Almost all of our previous concerns for this program have been met, the one exception being what we continue to see as an excessive amount of bulk in the proposed buildings.

It is not altogether a matter of height -- in fact we approve of matching the height of the attic story of the Commerce Department in the new structure directly across Fourteenth Street. The question is how far does this height, which is greater than the norm for the rest of the Triangle, penetrate the entire complex. At this point we believe it ought to be limited to just that portion of the building across from Commerce and in the same relative depth.

Perhaps more important than height, however, is the sheer size of the lot coverage. As one looks at the model of the diagrammatic proposal, one is immediately struck by the greater density of the new construction -- thicker buildings, less open space, and narrower site constrictions. It looks heavy and tight, and the site seems to beg for less bulk. We have no magic numbers at hand, but our best estimate is that an overall reduction of bulk in the order of 20% - 25% is more nearly the right answer. The final figure is subject to many variables, not the least of which is design. But as a starter, the Commission believes that this program will be greatly improved by putting a substantially lower limit on the above-grade building mass that will be permitted.

Having said this, I wish to reemphasize the Commission's enthusiastic support for this project. In addition to completing one of the last remaining building sites in the Federal Triangle it will, with the right mix of tenants and design, be a great asset to the life of the Avenue and the city as a whole, and we look forward to the implementation of this important work.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
PADC
Suite 1220 North
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

CAROLYN J. DEAVER
ROY M. GOODMAN
FREDERICK E. HART
NEIL H. PORTERFIELD
PASCAL REGAN
DIANE WOLF

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT H

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

3 May 1988

Dear Mrs. Ortega:

At its meeting on 21 April the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for three medals to commemorate the Young Astronauts Program. We would like to commend the Young Astronauts Council for their nationwide design competition and congratulate the children whose designs were chosen.

Given the small size of the medals - especially the gold medal - the members thought the designs would be more effective if there were fewer elements; for example, the inscriptions and minute detail on the two renditions of the spacecraft will not be readable when reduced to medal size. Similarily, the inclusion of the words "Liberty" and "In God We Trust" further complicate the designs and give the impression that these are coins rather than medals. If the words could be removed it would be possible to space some of the other elements farther apart, particularly the stars in two of the designs, and provide some breathing space.

The members were also puzzled by the initials "TM" on the common reverse and "RA" on two, but not on the third, of the obverse designs.

The Commission would like to see the plaster models when they are ready. In the meantime, the staff would be happy to assist you in any way possible.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Katherine D. Ortega
Treasurer of the United States
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D. C. 20220

EXHIBIT I

21 April 1988 AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 88-119 HPA. 88-426	3610-3612 P Street, N.W. Georgetown University Residences	Two new houses - concept development

ACTION: No objection to concept of new houses as shown in drawings for alternative B received and dated 6 April 1988. Submit construction drawings for review and approval when ready.

S.L. 88-42	7417 16th Street, N.W. Roger & Linda Bookhultz New house design	New house - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new single family residence.

S.L. 88-63 HPA. 88-503	2609 Klingle Road, N.W. John Ford Residence	New house - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept of new single family residence provided wood shingles are substituted for proposed stucco as an exterior finish material for all elevations. Submit working drawings for review by CFA before issuance of permit.

S.L. 88-60	2328 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Louis Statzer Residence	Rear addition - permit

ACTION: On HOLD for AGENDA of CFA meeting 19 May 1988. (community input).

S.L. 88-61 HPA.	2202 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. Lisa & Timothy O'Brien Residence	Retaining wall & fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuing permit for stucco finish retaining wall on Woodley Road side only of property as high as existing flat lawn surface with plain iron fence above and continuing at top of bank on Cathedral Avenue side. Recommend that stucco be painted to match house.(This action taken after contact with the ANC).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT J

9 May 1988

Dear Mrs. Kaptur:

I am happy to add to the record the Commission's support for H.R. 3742, authorizing a memorial commemorating and honoring Americans who participated in World War II. Such a memorial is long overdue. Our only question is whether a museum should be part and parcel to the memorial, and we tend to think it should not.

Unlike the Holocaust Memorial which seeks to tell a very special story through the museum and is purposefully instructional, or even the Pershing Memorial, which to an extent depicts battle lines and the geographically limited action of the American Expeditionary Forces, a memorial to World War II is different. The geographical perimeters of the effect of the war were virtually unbounded, and the range and variety of services and kinds of military action were so vast as to proscribe any literal kind of message, even through the resources of a very large museum. It simply is too much to encompass.

Also, I believe it can be argued that focusing on the hardware and specific events of an extensive military action, were it possible in fact to do so in a comprehensive way, may very well detract from the historical and human dimensions of the conflict. One can only point to the Vietnam Memorial and question what effect any kind of museum would have on the enormous emotional impact conveyed by this remarkable memorial.

As you may know, a major military museum is at least being contemplated for the Washington area by the Smithsonian. The Navy already has a modest one at the old Navy Yard, also the Marines. The Air Force has a very complete display at Wright Patterson Field in Ohio, and there are in addition all kinds of military museums spread across the country. Therefore there seems to be ample opportunity to tell the specifics of the military history of the second World War -- what is lacking is one national marker in the core of our capital that commemorates these events and the men and women who participated in them. In the Commission's view, this should be found in a single memorial element.

Finally, the Commission is glad to see that the bill provides for public funding. While permitting private gifts, the bulk of the funds will come from appropriations, which is as it should be. The American people as a whole, especially the generations too young to know, owe an enormous debt to those who served and died in World War II, and this is the most appropriate way to make such a statement.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Marcy Kaptur
Chairwoman
Subcommission on Housing
and Memorial Affairs
335 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

MEETING:

19 May 1988